DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 804 HE 030 955

AUTHOR Cress, Christine M.
TITLE Multiculturalism in the Classroom: Predictors of Faculty Efforts To Diversify Course Content. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (22nd, Albuquerque, NM, November 6-9, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Black Teachers; Blacks; *College Faculty; *Course Content; Ethnic Groups; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Environment; Intellectual Disciplines; Mexican Americans; Minority Group Teachers; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; National Surveys; Puerto Ricans; Racial Factors; Sex Differences; Teacher Background; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Higher Education Research Institute

ABSTRACT

Using data from the Higher Education Research Institute, this study sought to create a profile that would identify college faculty involved in creating a curriculum that is more inclusive on racial and ethnic issues and to identify individual and institutional factors that facilitate efforts toward multicultural course content. The study analyzed data from a 1995-96 national survey of college faculty that reported responses from 33,986 full-time college and university faculty members at 384 two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. The dependent variable was the inclusion of readings on racial and ethnic issues; independent variables were personal characteristics, professional background, individual goals and attitudes, institutional characteristics, and perceptions of institutional values and goals. Among the findings were: Puerto Rican/American faculty were more than twice as likely as white faculty to include racial and ethnic readings in courses, followed by Mexican American/Chicano and African American/Black faculty. These groups were three to four times more likely to include such readings than Asian American/Asian faculty, a finding possibly related to the high numbers of Asian Americans in the physical sciences. Other findings indicated some gender differences and a greater effect of individual characteristics than institutional environments. (Contains 39 references.) (DB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 415 804

# "Multiculturalism in the Classroom: Predictors of Faculty Efforts to Diversify Course Content"

Christine M. Cress

Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), Albuquerque, NM, November 6, 1997

Contact Information:
Christine M. Cress
Research Analyst
Higher Education Research Institute
University of California, Los Angeles
3039 Moore Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095
(310) 825-1925
ccress@ucla.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 030 955

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 6-9, 1997. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

> "That education should be regulated by law and should be an affair of state is not to be denied, but what should be the character of this public education, and how young persons should be educated, are questions which remain to be considered. For mankind are by no means agreed about the things to be taught, whether we look to virtue or the best life" (Politics, Aristotle, as cited in Perry, 1987).

Debate over the nature of the curriculum is not a new phenomenon. Although the forms and fecundity of knowledge have increased exponentially since the time of Aristotle, American institutions of higher education differ widely in opinion about what "things [are] to be taught" and what kinds of learning constitute the character of an informed and virtuous citizen. As higher education has evolved, colleges and universities have been especially challenged by what facets of new knowledge to incorporate in their systems while maintaining time-honored classical "truths". Indeed, the concept of multiculturalism-- referred to here as the inclusion of texts and readings on racial and ethnic issues--has sparked significant controversy and discussion in the last decade. Many institutions, as well as individual faculty, are grappling with the role that multiculturalism should play as a central or peripheral feature of the curriculum. To further complicate matters, certain disciplines and fields do not always lend themselves easily to multicultural treatment.

Despite the challenges and controversies, however, a recent study at the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles (Sax, Astin, Arredondo, & Korn, 1996) indicates an *increase* over the last six years in the number of faculty including multicultural readings in their courses, while concurrently showing a *decrease* in the number of faculty who believe that it is essential or very important to teach students the classic works of Western civilization. Using data from the Higher Education Research Institute, this study sought to

identify a profile of those faculty involved in creating a more inclusive curriculum regarding racial and ethnic issues and to identify individual and institutional factors which facilitate those efforts toward multiculturalizing course content. In particular, the research was framed around three central questions: 1) what motivates an individual faculty to incorporate readings on racial and ethnic issues?; 2) are these motivations centered in personal or professional background characteristics?; and 3) does the environment of an institution play a role in facilitating these efforts?

## Literature Review

Over the last two decades a number of forces have facilitated curricular considerations and change. To provide some context for faculty pedagogical decisions this literature review will examine the critique and controversy over multicultural efforts in higher education, the relationship between curriculum and educational environments, supplementary factors which encourage curricular transformation, and it will highlight previous research on the subject of faculty motivations for refining and redefining pedagogy.

### *Critique of higher education curriculum*

Critics of higher education and responses to them in the 1980's (Bennett, 1984; Boyer, 1987; Mortimer, 1984) called for dramatic curricular change in undergraduate education. According to these reports, a strong liberal arts or general education component must form the core of the curriculum. Some believed that this core should be based on classic works that concern the "verities" of Western civilization. Others felt that a less prescribed curriculum but

one dedicated to problem solving, analytical and communication skills held the key to institutional success (Toombs and Tierney, 1991).

The so-called demise of the curriculum was blamed, among other things, on changing student populations. As minorities and women continued to seek access to higher education, their presence became associated by some (Bloom, 1987) with the watering down of the curriculum and the inclusion of trivial texts at the expense of the "traditional canon." It was also argued that "as a way of expanding access to all levels of higher education, faculty and administrators lowered standards for courses, student promotion, and graduation" (Conrad, 1985, p.5). William Bennett, previous Director of the National Endowment for the Humanities, even accused multiculturalists and feminists of designing a globally-oriented curriculum which undermines traditional American values and which is unpatriotic. He stated, "They [are] failing to instill in students a pride in the West, which ha[s] set 'the moral, political, economic and social standards for the rest of the world' (Craige, 1993, p. 119)."

Contrary to this perspective resided (and reside) advocates of a new curriculum based on "cultural holism"--a world of dynamic, complex, and open systems of interdependent cultures, none of which enjoys any absolute superiority to any other and all of which evolve in relation to each other and their nonhuman environment (Craige, 1993). Not surprisingly, this conceptualization of educational paradigms has found its greatest support from academics outside the mainstream; most often from feminists and multiculturalists (Banks, 1993). Those most likely, therefore, to challenge academic traditions and initiate curricular change tend to be women faculty and faculty of color who hold a multicultural perspective--that is, a strong belief

that cultural diversity is a valuable resource that should be preserved and extended without any particular dominating viewpoint (McCarthy, 1993).

Although some educators have applauded the creation of ethnically-related programs and courses which seem to demonstrate that higher education is relatively sensitive to diversity issues (Princes & Igbineweka, 1995), others point out that America's educational programs continue to exclude members of minority groups and resist the infusion of multicultural curricula (Obiakor, 1994). In other words, while higher education has appeared to tolerate a few voices in the name of free speech and academic freedom, the fact is that "most students in the United States are socialized within communities that are segregated along racial, ethnic and social-class lines...[and many] American youth have few opportunities to learn firsthand about the cultures of people from different racial, ethnic, cultural, religious and social-class groups" (Banks, 1993, pp. 7-8).

***Higher education curriculum and the climate for students of color***

Banks (1993) emphasizes that traditional school norms and knowledge are more consistent with the cultural experiences of most White middle-class students than for most students of color. "The cultural knowledge that many African American, Latino, and American Indian students bring to school [can] conflict with school norms and values, with school knowledge, and with the ways that teachers interpret and mediate knowledge" (p.7). The result is that some students of color have been identified as believing that if they master the knowledge taught in schools they may violate kinship norms and run the risk of "acting White" (Fordham, 1991; Rodriquez, 1982).

Sleeter (1992) examined the treatment of race, class, gender, and disability in textbooks. The study indicated that although textbooks had largely eliminated sexist language and incorporated images of ethnic minorities, they fail to help students develop an understanding of the complex cultures of ethnic groups, an understanding of racism, sexism, and classism, and they tend to portray the United States as a land of opportunity which has largely overcome its problems. Perhaps, this is why Astin (1993) found that White college students tend to agree with the proposition that "racial discrimination is no longer a problem." An attitude that may be exacerbated for Whites since the races, notes Astin, tend to segregate themselves during the undergraduate years.

Pinar (1993) believes that the curriculum is a highly representative form of racial text which imbues an American national identity. The Eurocentric character of the school curriculum functions not only to deny role models to students of color but to deny self-understanding to White students. Takaki (1995) asserts that this prevailing academic paradigm creates an alienating climate for students of color. "While the study of the past can provide collective self-knowledge, it often reflects the scholar's particular perspective or view of the world. What happens when historians leave out many of America's peoples? What happens, to borrow the words of Adrienne Rich, 'when someone with the authority of a teacher describes our society, and you are not in it? Such an experience can be disorienting--a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing' (p.16)."

***Other external and internal forces which encourage curricular change***

Given the reality of shifting student populations and multiple perspectives concerning the construction of knowledge, some faculty hold that to adequately prepare for a future where facts and methods become obsolete quickly, students must understand the cultures and viewpoints of their future colleagues, customers, competitors and neighbors (Simpson and Frost, 1993). On an international level for the twenty-first century, "we'll be only one member in a global dynamic economy with tremendous network interdependency between countries" (Sculley, 1988, p. 174). Perhaps, more than ever before, individuals will be courted, hired and advanced in companies that value international competencies. For examples, managers in banking and transportation need to speak the language of their clients, negotiators in business need to understand the culture of their competitors, and researchers need to build on the work of their international colleagues (Simpson and Frost, 1993; James, 1993).

***Previous research on faculty motivations for curricular change***

While various forces within and outside of the academy serve to stir up the multicultural debate, previous research has indicated a variety of personal motivations and institutional environments that facilitate faculty efforts to change existing curricula (Kozma, Belle, and Williams, 1978). For instance, Mulkay's (1972) study of science faculty indicated that low status and young scientists were more likely to be academically innovative and employ alternative teaching practices. More recently, Statham, Richardson and Cook (1991) found that assistant professors were more likely to adopt participatory teaching practices than full professors. They also found that female professors were more likely than male professors to use

student-centered pedagogy. This is consistent with the work of Gumport (1991, 1990, and 1988) who reports that feminist faculty often conceptualize academic approaches different from the idealized notions of their academic organizations, and tend to advocate "interdisciplinarity" which can result in conflict with academic traditions.

Similarly, Milem and Astin (1992) found gender to be a positive predictor of innovative teaching practices. Women faculty in the sciences, as compared to their male colleagues, were much more likely to utilize active learning techniques such as class discussion and student-selected topics in their classrooms. Also, Sax, Astin, Arredondo, and Korn (1996) found that younger faculty and female faculty are more likely to utilize cooperative learning and to include readings on race and gender issues in their courses.

Wakai (1994) also found that women faculty, faculty with a liberal political ideology, and faculty in the field of education were positively associated with new forms of pedagogy. In addition, faculty who teach in the physical sciences were far less likely to be engaged in innovative teaching practices. In addition, Milem and Wakai (1996), using results from a 1992 survey, found that faculty who are most likely to include multicultural readings in the curriculum are: women; African Americans, American Indians, Mexican Americans; and those with teaching appointments in education, humanities and the social sciences.

Stark, Lowther, Ryan, and Genthon (1988) and Stark, Lowther, Bentley, and Martens (1990), found that, not surprisingly, faculty tend to build from their own academic field or discipline training when designing curricula. They also conclude that institutional environments have only a negligible to slight effect on faculty decisions about course planning.

However, other researchers argue that institutional characteristics influence college teaching practices through the faculty's perception of undergraduate educational goals, institutional priorities and mission, and organizational climate (Easton and Guskey, 1983). Institutional views and expectations regarding pedagogy communicate to faculty acceptable and unacceptable methodological practices (Mauksch,1981). Further, different types of institutions tend to devote varying amounts of time to teaching and research which can influence teaching methods (Finkelstein, 1984). For example, research by Astin (1993) indicates that faculty at universities are less likely to spend time teaching and advising students, teaching general education courses and using active learning techniques than faculty at liberal arts and comprehensive colleges.

In spite of the critiques, the debates, and the challenges facing higher education, and in spite of the fact that some educators adamantly purport that the alternative to Eurocentrism is fragmentation, chaos, and the demise of civilization akin to the biblical city of Gomorrah (Bork, 1996), many faculty are "multiculturalizing" their curricula. ***Therefore, the question remains as to who are these faculty and what might motivate them to change their traditional course content to include a wider diversity of perspectives?*** The following study is designed to address these queries by identifying those factors which predict the teaching practices of faculty regarding the inclusion of readings on racial and ethnic issues in the classroom, and, unlike previous studies, it is specifically designed to identify differences and similarities in motivations for male and female faculty.

## Methodology

### *Data Source*

Data used in this study were gathered in conjunction with a triennial national survey of college faculty conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (UCLA). In the Fall and Winter of 1995-96, a total of 143,816 questionnaires were mailed to faculty at over 403 institutions across the country. Of these 403 institutions, 62 were dropped from the national data base because of low response rates, leaving 341. After examining the characteristics of participating institutions on a 23-cell stratification scheme based on institutional type, selectivity and control, 43 supplemental schools were sent questionnaires. The results reported here are based on the responses of 33,986 full-time college and university faculty members at 384 two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities.

For the purposes of this study, full-time faculty engaged in undergraduate education are defined as meeting at least one of the following criteria: 1) employed full-time at the institution and noted teaching as his/her principal activity; 2) employed full-time at the institution and taught at least two courses in the last term, at least one of which was at the undergraduate level; or 3) employed full-time at the institution and spent at least 9 hours per week in scheduled teaching, but did not specify the level of courses being taught.

In order to approximate as closely as possible the results that would have been obtained if all college and university teaching faculty in all institutions had responded to the survey, a multistage weighting procedure was employed based on within institution categories (all combinations of gender and academic rank) and between institution categories (such as control type, selectivity, etc.). For a detailed description of weighting procedures, see Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Arredondo, M., and Korn, W. S. (1996).

### *Variables and Method of Analysis*

The analysis consisted of two parts. First, a descriptive analysis was performed to identify a profile of faculty at institutions with respect to inclusion of "multicultural" ( racial and ethnic related) readings. Crosstabulations were performed on the variables of gender,

race/ethnicity, academic rank and departmental affiliation. Confidence levels are not reported for the crosstabular analyses as the large sample size of the dataset results in highly statistically significant chi-square tests, even for small differences. Attention in the discussion, therefore, is concentrated on meaningful comparisons that could be drawn from the data.

Second, a linear step-wise regression was completed to predict personal and institutional variables most likely to be associated with faculty use of readings on racial and ethnic issues in the classroom. Since previous research pointed to the fact that women are more likely than men to include multicultural readings in their classrooms, separate regression analyses were performed for male faculty and female faculty in order to identify possible gender-related distinctions in motivations.

The dependent variable "include readings on racial and ethnic issues in undergraduate courses" is coded: 1--none, 2--some, 3--most, and 4--all. Initially, the dependent variable was collapsed and recoded as a dummy variable (1--no race readings, 2--uses race readings) and run using logistic regression. However, the final solutions for both regression types were identical. Therefore, since logistic regression is incapable of producing intermediate solutions, the computational advantages favored the regression offering step-by-step beta changes for the analysis.

The independent variables were entered into the regression in five relatively temporally-ordered blocks to facilitate step-wise analysis and allow for controlling of input variables. The five groupings are *personal characteristics, professional background, individual goals and attitudes, institutional characteristics, and perceptions of institutional values and goals.*

*Personal characteristics* included race and age. *Professional background* included factors that might influence the faculty member's interest in or attitudes toward the inclusion of racially-related readings: highest degree earned, academic rank, and current departmental affiliation (geography, social work, sociology, political science, anthropology, law, math/computer science, women's studies, ethnic studies, psychology, physical sciences, biological sciences, business, education, other humanities, health sciences, history, foreign language, English or fine arts).

*Individual goals and attitudes* included: a) current political orientation; b) attitudes toward goals for undergraduate education: increase desire and ability to undertake self-directed learning, develop moral character, teach students the classic works of Western civilization, and enhance student's self-understanding; c) general opinions regarding the following statements: racist/sexist speech should be banned on campus, Western civilization and culture should be the foundation of the undergraduate curriculum, college officials have the right to ban persons with extreme views from speaking on campus, and colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems; and d) the personal importance of: becoming an authority in my field, influencing the political structure, influencing social values, helping others who are in difficulty, becoming involved in programs to clean-up the environment, developing a meaningful philosophy of life, and helping to promote racial understanding.

*Institutional characteristics* consisted of eight dichotomous variables and two continuous variables. The dichotomous measures characterized the institution of each faculty member with respect to institutional control, type and religious affiliation. A measure of institutional selectivity based on the average SAT composite of freshman class and institutional size round out the second category of variables (see Appendix A for a complete list of variables).

Finally, the fifth block, *perceptions of institutional values and goals* included measures of aggregate faculty's views about their institution's priorities and campus climate. Since peer perspectives can create cultures of acceptable and unacceptable teaching practices, the mean responses (as opposed to the individual responses) of faculty at each institution were used as the environmental variables. Statements included faculty beliefs about their institution's priority: to help students understand and examine their personal values, to hire more minority faculty and administrators, to develop a sense of community among students and faculty, to develop leadership among students, to hire more women faculty and administrators, to recruit more minority students, and to create a diverse multicultural campus environment. Statements reflecting beliefs about the campus environment included: most faculty are sensitive to the issues of minorities, faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically, many courses

include minority group perspectives, there is little trust between minority and student groups and campus administrators, there is a lot of racial conflict here, many courses include feminist perspectives, faculty of color are treated fairly here, and women faculty are treated fairly here. And, statements believed to describe the institution included: there is a great deal of conformity among the students, most of the students are very bright, the institution is genuinely committed to helping minority students succeed, and faculty are rewarded for being good teachers.

As mentioned earlier, hierarchical analysis facilitated the examination of the influence of the independent variables in a meaningful order. That is, the influence of *institutional characteristics* was examined only after controlling for *personal characteristics*. Although it is impossible to determine the exact temporal ordering of *individual goals and attitudes* versus *perceptions of institutional values and goals*, these sets of variables are distinct enough from one another to warrant separate blocking and entering. Within each block, the independent variables were tested for stepwise entry using a confidence level of $p<.001$. Listwise deletion resulted in 30, 733 cases.

## Limitations

This study has three primary limitations. First, the study relies on self-reports of faculty who chose to fill out the survey. Research has shown that individuals who choose to respond to surveys do not always replicate the distribution of the population. Second, although careful consideration and expertise were given to weighting the sample to create a normative representation of faculty, error can occur which may skew results to an unknown extent. Finally, for the purposes of the study the dependent variable "includes readings on racial and ethnic issues in courses" is a very narrow definition of multiculturalism. Certainly, multiculturalism as a broader concept normally includes issues related to disability, gender, and sexual orientation. Also, it is quite feasible that a faculty member could include just one reading on racial/ethnic issues in each course but still check "all courses." In this case, it could be that the faculty member is simply paying lipservice to diversity rather than equating the effort to a commitment

to diversifying the course or "multiculturalizing" the curriculum. However, the zero-order correlations of including such readings with the personal goal of desiring to promote racial understanding is quite positive (r=.34 (male) and r=.39 (female)). Clearly, additional follow-up studies are needed which examine the specific effects of the inclusion of racial/ethnic readings in courses on students.

## Results

### *Descriptive Analyses*

In contrast to Schlesinger's notion that multiculturalism will be abandoned "once the great silent majority of professors cry 'enough' and challenge what they know to be voguish nonsense" (Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., as quoted in Bork, 1996), currently about 11 percent of male faculty and 24 percent of female faculty include multicultural readings in "all" or "most of their courses. Another 25 percent of men and 32 percent of women report using multicultural readings in at least "some" of their courses, for a total of 36 percent of male faculty and 56 percent of female faculty (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Faculty Instructional Technique of Including Readings on Racial and Ethnic Issues, by Sex** (Source: Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles)

| | Includes Readings on Racial/Ethnic Issues in Courses (percent) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty | all or most | some | total |
| Men | 11 | 25 | 36 |
| Women | 24 | 32 | 56 |

Note: actual n's are shown, but percentages are weighted
men, n = 21,508, women, n = 11,746

The data for including readings on racial and ethnic issues based on a faculty member's racial/ethnic background indicate that Puerto Rican American faculty are more than twice as likely as White faculty to include racial and ethnic readings in *most* or *all* of their courses (see Table 2).

They are followed by Mexican American/Chicano/a and African American/Black faculty who report using racial and ethnic related readings in nearly one-third of *most* or *all* of their courses. These faculty are also three to four times more likely to include readings on racial or ethnic issues than are Asian American/Asian faculty.

**Table 2: Faculty Instructional Technique of Including Readings on Racial and Ethnic Issues, by Race** (Source: Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles)

| Racial/Ethnic Background | Includes Readings on Racial/Ethnic Issues in Courses (percent) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | none | some | most or all |
| Puerto Rican American | 36 | 28 | 36 |
| Mexican American/Chicano/a | 42 | 24 | 34 |
| African American/Black | 36 | 34 | 30 |
| American Indian | 41 | 34 | 25 |
| other Latino/a | 44 | 35 | 21 |
| White/Caucasian | 58 | 27 | 15 |
| Asian American/Asian | 73 | 18 | 9 |

Note: percentages are weighted

Some of these distinctions, particularly in the case of Asian American faculty, can be accounted for by academic field or discipline. Forty-five percent of Asian American male faculty and 23 percent of Asian American female faculty were trained in the physical sciences. In comparison, approximately 20 percent of African American and American Indian faculty and over a third (34 percent) of Latino/a faculty received their degrees in the humanities (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997).

Regarding academic departments, then, faculty who are most likely to include racial/ethnic readings in all or most of their courses tend to teach in the humanities and social sciences (see Table 3). This is in stark contrast to over 90 percent of physical science faculty who report that

none of their courses include multicultural readings. Interestingly, education faculty rank towards the middle of the table since only about one-fifth of these faculty incorporate multicultural readings in the majority of their courses. These findings are also consistent with Wakai (1994) who reported that faculty in the sciences are the least likely to be involved with innovative teaching practices. Certainly, the extent and ease of incorporating racial/ethnic readings in a history course is quite different from doing so, in say, solid state physics.

**Table 3: Faculty Instructional Technique of Including Readings on Racial and Ethnic Issues, by Department** (Source: Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles)

| | Includes Readings on Racial/Ethnic Issues in Courses (percent) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Department | none | some | most or all |
| Humanities | 24 | 44 | 32 |
| Social Science | 33 | 38 | 29 |
| Education | 43 | 37 | 20 |
| Fine Arts | 62 | 29 | 9 |
| Life Science | 72 | 21 | 7 |
| Business | 74 | 21 | 5 |
| Physical Science | 94 | 5 | 1 |

Note: percentages are weighted

Finally, Table 4 indicates that assistant professors--those who are generally newest to the academy--are the most likely to include multicultural readings in all or most of their courses. At the opposite end of the spectrum, full professors are the least likely to incorporate readings on racial and ethnic issues in their courses. Obviously, as full professors retire and are replaced by incoming assistant professors, the trend toward multiculturalism is likely to gain ground as more courses include a discussion of racial and ethnic issues. However, Table 4 also clearly highlights

that over half of all faculty, at any rank, still do not include a multicultural emphasis in their curricula.

**Table 4: Faculty Instructional Technique of including readings on Racial and Ethnic Issues, by Academic Rank** (Source: Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles)

| | Includes Readings on Racial/Ethnic Issues in Courses (percent) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Rank | none | some | most or all |
| Assistant Professor | 52 | 28 | 20 |
| Lecturer | 58 | 26 | 16 |
| Associate Professor | 57 | 28 | 15 |
| Professor | 61 | 27 | 12 |

Note: percentages are weighted

***Regression Analyses*:**

In order to identify what motivates and facilitates faculty's inclusion of racial and ethnic readings in courses, regression analyses were completed. As mentioned earlier, since previous research points toward differences in faculty motivations for men and women, separate regression analyses were performed for male faculty and female faculty.

Table 5 lists all the variables that entered the equation at a confidence level of $p<.001$ and maintained their statistical significance in the last step. For simplicity, only the entering and final coefficients for each variable are shown. Zero-order correlations are also included to compare the multivariate relationships with bivariate correlations.

Results of the regressions indicate that of the *personal characteristic* variables, American Indian faculty and Mexican American/Chicano faculty are significantly positively associated with the dependent variable of including readings on racial and ethnic issues in classrooms. On the

other hand, the race variable representing Asian American faculty is negatively associated with such activity.

For both regressions, the variable for age did not enter the equation. For the male regression, all the race variables for faculty of color initially entered the regression except for the variable representing Puerto Rican faculty. However, the faculty of color race variables lost their statistical significance once the individual goals and attitudes variables entered the equation. What this tells us, then, is that race/ethnicity alone can be relatively predictive of a male faculty's curricular decisions because of the intricate link with an individual faculty's goals and attitudes.

A similar situation occurred in the female regression, with two exceptions; the variable representing Mexican American/Chicana faculty did not enter and the race variable for White faculty initially entered the equation as statistically negatively associated with including multicultural readings. The White faculty variable lost its significance after the individual goals and attitudes variables entered the equation. For White female faculty this means that their inclinations toward not including racial and ethnic readings tend to be centered more in individual factors than in professional background characteristics. The African American faculty variable lost its statistical significance as the departmental affiliation variables entered the equation. Overall, one to two percent of the variance was accounted for in this first block.

As for *professional background* characteristics, faculty with their Ph.D. degree are more likely to include multicultural readings. However, for male faculty, those in the lower academic ranks are the most likely to emphasize racial/ethnic issues in the classroom. This is consistent with earlier findings (Mulkay, 1972; Statham, Richardson, & Cook, 1991; Milem and Wakai, 1996) who indicated that lower ranking professors were more likely to adopt novel teaching

**Table 5: Results of Blocked Hierarchical Regressions for Faculty--Inclusion of Readings on Racial and Ethnic Issues, by Sex.**

| | simple r | | Beta at entry | | Final Beta | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables* | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| **personal characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Race: American Indian | 05 | 05 | 036 | 038 | 029** | 027** |
| Race: Asian American | -04 | -05 | -044 | -046 | -023** | -049** |
| Race: Mex Am/Chicano | 05 | 04 | 044 | dne | 015* | dne |
| (male $R^2$=01)(female $R^2$=02) | | | | | | |
| **professional background** | | | | | | |
| Highest Degree Earned | 05 | 12 | 036 | 108 | 049** | 054** |
| Academic Rank | -01 | 03 | -029 | dne | -025** | dne |
| English | 24 | 24 | 206 | 237 | 178** | 170** |
| Sociology | 17 | 16 | 161 | 153 | 122** | 107** |
| History | 20 | 13 | 189 | 173 | 154** | 099** |
| Social Work | 11 | 13 | 098 | 125 | 088** | 087** |
| Anthropology | 10 | 10 | 073 | 088 | 071** | 069** |
| Political Science | 11 | 06 | 076 | 045 | 077** | 039** |
| Ethnic Studies | 07 | 04 | 056 | 036 | 049** | 026** |
| Other Humanities | 09 | 08 | 054 | 057 | 045** | 038** |
| Geography | 01 | -01 | 051 | 034 | 041** | 025** |
| Women's Studies | na | 07 | na | 057 | na | 042* |
| Education | 07 | 04 | 038 | dne | 028** | dne |
| Foreign Language | 04 | 04 | 021 | dne | 018* | dne |
| Physical Sciences | -27 | -19 | -267 | -160 | -189** | -136** |
| Biological Sciences | -16 | -17 | -179 | -112 | -146** | -150** |
| Math/Computer Science | -17 | -20 | -145 | -176 | -121** | -117** |
| Fine Arts | -05 | -09 | -115 | -076 | -070** | -080** |
| Business | -08 | -11 | -122 | -115 | -065** | -067** |
| Health Sciences | -05 | -06 | -081 | -076 | -050** | -033** |
| (male $R^2$=30)(female $R^2$=26) | | | | | | |
| **individual goals and attitudes** | | | | | | |
| Political View: liberal | 25 | 30 | 100 | 117 | 079** | 096** |
| *general opinions:* | | | | | | |
| Western civ shld be foundation | -07 | -15 | -067 | -087 | -061** | -081** |
| Colleges shld solve socl prblms | 19 | 25 | 028 | 174 | 031** | 039** |
| Colleges prohbt racist/sexist spch | -03 | 02 | -026 | dne | -027** | dne |
| *personal goals:* | | | | | | |
| influence social values | 30 | 32 | 082 | 081 | 069** | 063** |
| influence political structure | 27 | 31 | 114 | 141 | 066** | 084** |
| promote racial understanding | 34 | 39 | 229 | 286 | 151** | 049** |
| become an authority in field | 01 | 06 | -031 | dne | -020** | dne |
| develop meaningful life philsphy | 11 | 13 | -029 | -033 | -031** | -034** |
| *goal for undergraduates:* | | | | | | |
| enhance self-understanding | 23 | 20 | 055 | 055 | 055** | 056** |
| (male $R^2$=38)(female $R^2$=38) | | | | | | |
| **institutional characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Total Undergrad. Enrollment | -06 | -01 | -033 | -030 | -030** | -032** |
| (male $R^2$=38)(female $R^2$=38) | | | | | | |
| **perceptions of institution** | | | | | | |
| Courses incld minrty prspctves | 10 | 07 | 042 | dne | 042** | dne |
| Priority to create multicIt envirnmt | 07 | 08 | dne | 032 | dne | 032** |
| (male $R^2$=38)(female $R^2$=38) | | | | | | |

*Notes: not all entering variables included, only those which retained significance at the final step. *p<.01, **p<.001 dne--variable did not enter for specific gender regression. na- not applicable, no male faculty in women's studies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

practices. Such findings appear to point to the fact that at least part of the multicultural curricular effort might be driven by concerns on behalf of academically lower-ranked faculty over the tenure and promotion process.

Nine academic departments were statistically positively associated with racial readings for both of the regressions. Listed in order of the strength of the final beta are: English, Sociology, History, Social Work, Anthropology, Political Science, Ethnic Studies, Other Humanities, and Geography. For male faculty, the departments of Education and Foreign Language were also statistically significant. For the female regression, Women's Studies maintained its positive significance.

Six academic departments were statistically negatively associated with the dependent variable of including readings on racial and ethnic readings in courses: Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Math/Computer Science, Fine Arts, Business, and Health Sciences. These results support earlier findings that science faculty are the least likely to try innovative instructional methods. Two other departments, Law and Psychology, did not enter either regression.

The professional background variable block accounted for 29 percent of the variance for the male regression and 24 percent of the variance for the female regression. (It should be noted that no male faculty claimed to be a full-time member of a Women's Studies department. It should also be noted that areas of specialization within a department are not accounted for which could have an impact on faculty interests and/or willingness to change course curricula.)

The third block, *individual goals and attitudes*, resulted in six common statistically significant positive variables: having a liberal political view; holding the belief that colleges

should be involved in solving social problems; holding the personal goals of desiring to influence social values, influence the political structure and promote racial understanding; and affirming as a goal for undergraduates that college should enhance students' self-understanding. These findings are consistent with Wakai (1994) and with Milem and Wakai (1996) who found that faculty having a liberal political ideology tend more often to include multicultural readings in their curriculum.

Two common variables between the male and female regressions were negatively associated with the dependent variable: having the belief that Western civilization should serve as the foundation of the curriculum and having the personal goal of desiring to develop a meaningful philosophy of life. While the reason for the outcome of the first of these variables seems quite evident, the later is a little more complex to interpret given that having the goal of wanting to develop a meaningful philosophy of life has a positive simple correlation with the dependent variable but results in a statistically significant negative beta; albeit a small one.

The variable for developing a meaningful philosophy of life is quite complex factorially, and includes a relatively high correlation with the variable for desiring to promote racial understanding (r=.43). Therefore, when the variable for desiring to promote racial understanding is controlled for, that part of the "develop a meaningful philosophy of life" variable which still enters the equation is more residually associated with other conservative opinion variables and tends, therefore, to be associated with individuals who are <u>not</u> inclined toward the inclusion of multicultural readings.

Desiring to obtain recognition from peers through becoming an authority in one's field and holding the opinion that racist and sexist speech should be prohibited on campus were negatively

associated with the dependent variable for only the male faculty. The negative relationship of this last variable with the dependent variable should be considered in light of the fact that constitutional freedom of speech issues and opinions tend to be widely dispersed among various political orientations. While many may hold that disparaging remarks about specific groups or individuals are inappropriate, debate exists as to "the right" of an individual to express such views in a learning environment.

The *individual goals and attitude* variable block accounted for 8 percent of the variance for the male regression and 12 percent of the variance for the female regression.

Although it was predicted that the type of institution would be predictive of faculty efforts in incorporating multicultural readings, the only variable that entered and maintained its statistical significance in the final step for the *institutional characteristics* block was total undergraduate enrollment, or size. Indeed, size was found to be negatively associated with the dependent variable indicating that larger institutions tend to have fewer faculty participating in multicultural efforts. Other types of four-year and two-year institutions, including religiously affiliated colleges and women's colleges, were not found to be statistically associated with the dependent variable. This block added only negligibly to the overall variance.

Finally, faculty peer environments were measured utilizing aggregated responses regarding *perceptions of the institution*. The analysis reveals that male faculty who believe that the courses at their institution already include a minority perspective are the most likely to incorporate multicultural readings in their classrooms. It could be suggested that these male faculty might include readings on racial and ethnic issues in their classrooms so that they don't appear to be outside of the normative teaching practices of their institutions. Female faculty, on the other

hand, appear to be interested in multiculturalizing the curriculum if they perceive that their institution values as a priority the creation of a diverse multicultural campus environment. This suggests that female faculty are motivated by the opportunity to utilize their own curricular changes as a way to help their institution realize its mission and goals.

For both regressions, the five blocks of variables accounted for about 38 percent of the variance.

## Discussion/Conclusion

The regression analyses indicate fairly similar characteristics and predictors for male and female faculty regarding the inclusion of racial and ethnic related readings in courses. Generally speaking, faculty of color (with the exception of Asian American faculty) are the most likely to make efforts to include readings on racial and ethnic issues. Also, faculty who teach in the humanities or social sciences (with the exception of psychology) are the most likely to incorporate multicultural readings as compared to faculty who teach in the physical sciences, business, life sciences, mathematics/computer science, fine arts or health sciences.

The most notable differences between male and female faculty have to do with academic rank and personal goals and attitudes. Since the academic rank variable for male faculty was negatively correlated with the dependent variable, the longer a faculty member has been in the higher education system the less likely he is to add readings on racial and ethnic issues in his course(s). Those faculty who are willing to do so tend to have more community-oriented types of personal goals such as wanting to influence social values, influence the political structure and promote racial understanding. This is also quite evident in the gender differences regarding

perceptions of the institution. Male faculty tend to incorporate multicultural readings because they consider their institution to have already made progress in that area, while female faculty tend to want to become a part of the change process in creating a multicultural environment.

Although it was postulated that faculty motivations for including racial and ethnic issues in the curriculum would be a combination of both individual characteristics and institutional environments, the regression analyses clearly indicate that individual characteristics play a much more significant role than do institutional environment variables. Instead, the primary motivations for an inclusive multicultural curriculum seem to be individually controlled, and internally rather than externally driven since less than one percent of the variance accounted for in each regression resided in the institutional environment variables.

Institutions which choose to emphasize a curriculum which is more reflective of racial and ethnic issues will have to identify strategies for engaging groups of faculty that do not tend to initiate such course focus on their own. Namely, male faculty, academically higher ranking faculty, White and Asian American/Asian faculty, and faculty who teach in the sciences, fine arts or business. Certainly, discussion needs to be facilitated that enable faculty to discern what an appropriate level of reflection and inclusion is possible in such areas as calculus or physical chemistry. In addition, an institutional assessment of course content regarding racial and ethnic issues might bring to light why only about one-half of education faculty include such readings, only one-fourth of business faculty do so, and why health sciences departments are significantly negatively correlated with such efforts.

Whether the forces driving higher education curricular re-examination are externally influenced or internally motivated, "wise choices are, in fact, the central challenge for the

curriculum" (Toombs and Tierney, 1991). If one comes to view an emphasis on multiculturalism as a creative opportunity for refining the curriculum for the twenty-first century, what might faculty consider in creating a more inclusive curricula? Schubert (1986) posits seven fundamental questions for faculty and institutions to consider: 1) how is knowledge reproduced?; 2) what are the sources of knowledge students acquire?; 3) how do students and teachers resist or contest what is conveyed through lived experiences?; 4) what impact does the curriculum have on students' outlook; 5) whose interests are served by the outlooks fostered in the curriculum?; 6) when served, do these interests move more in the direction of emancipation, equity and social justice or in the opposite direction; and 7) how can students be empowered through the curriculum?

Designing institutional curricula is not facile, but this study adds important insight into the personal and professional background characteristics of faculty who are willing to diversify their course content. It is also unique in independently assessing motivational factors for male and female faculty. Since department affiliation and individual goals and attitudes are much stronger predictors of including readings on racial and ethnic issues in courses than are institutional environment variables, this data may help institutions in their future endeavors to grapple with the complex issues of curriculum transformation and to develop strategies and policies which speaks to the heart of the matter--that is, individual faculty's own intrinsic goals and motivations.

Appendix A: Variables Used in Regression Analysis

| Variable | Coding |
|---|---|
| ***personal characteristics*** | |
| Age | 10 point scale, "less than 30" to "more than 70" |
| Race/Ethnicity | 8 dichotomous variables: White, African American/Black, American Indian, Asian American/Asian, Mexican American/Chicano/a, Puerto Rican American, other Latino, and other. |
| ***professional background*** | |
| Academic Rank | 4 point scale, "Instructor" to "Professor" |
| Highest Degree Earned | 4 point scale, "less than BA" to "Doctorate/Professional Degree" |
| Department Affiliation | 21 dichotomous variables: soc, psych, ed phys sci, bus, other hum, bio sci, anthro, geog, life sci, fine arts, soc wrk, poli sci, law, math/cs, womst, ethst, his, forlang, hlth sci, and English. |
| ***individual goals and attitudes*** | |
| Political View: liberal | 5 point scale, "far right" to "far left" |
| **Goals for Undergraduates:** | 4 point scale, "not important" to "very important" |
| increase self-directed learning | |
| develop moral character | |
| teach classics of Western Civ. | |
| enhance student's self-understanding | |
| **General Opinions:** | 4 point scale, "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly" |
| racist/sexist speech should be banned | |
| Western Civ should be foundation | |
| college offcls have rght to ban persons w/extrme vws frm spking on cmps | |
| colleges should be invlvd in solving social problems | |
| **Personal Importance of:** | 4 point scale, "not important" to "essential" |
| becoming an authority in my field | |
| influencing the political structure | |
| influencing social values | |
| helping others who are in difficulty | |
| dvlping meaningful philosophy of life | |
| helping to promote racial understanding | |
| obtaining recgn for spcl contrib to field | |

Appendix A Continued: Variables Used in Regression Analysis

| Variable | Coding |
|---|---|
| ***institutional characteristics*** | 1--"no", 2--"yes" |
| Public University | |
| Private University | |
| Public 4-year | |
| Private 4-year | |
| Public 2-year | |
| Private 2-year | |
| Women's College | |
| Religiously Affiliated College | |
| Selectivity (average SAT composite of freshman) | continuous scale |
| Total Undergrad. Enrollment | continuous scale |
| ***perspectives on institution*** | |
| **Institutional Priority:** | 4 point scale, "low priority" to "highest priority" |
| help stdnts undrstnd their values | |
| hire more minority fac. & admin. | |
| devlp cmmnity among stdnts & fac. | |
| develop leadership among students | |
| hire more women fac. & admin. | |
| recruit more minority students | |
| create multicultural campus envirnmnt | |
| **Campus Climate:** | 4 point scale, "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly" |
| most fac. sensitive to the issues of minorities | |
| fac. feel most students well-prepared academically | |
| many courses include minority group perspectives | |
| little trust between minority student groups & administration | |
| a lot of racial conflict here | |
| many courses inclde feminist prspctives | |
| faculty of color are treated fairly here | |
| women faculty are treated fairly here | |
| **Institutional Descriptions:** | 3 point scale, "not descriptive" to "very descriptive" |
| easy to see fac. outside office hours | |
| there is a great deal of conformity among the students | |
| most of the students are very bright | |
| institution is genuinely committed to helping minority students succeed | |
| faculty are rewarded for being good teachers | |
| ***dependent variable*** | 4 point scale, 1"none," 2"some," 3"most," 4"all" |
| includes readings on racial and ethnic issues in courses | |

**References**

Astin, A.W. (1993). What matters in college: Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., Cress, C. M., & Korn, W. S. (1997). Race and ethnicity in the American professoriate, 1995-96. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Banks, J. A. (1993). "The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. Educational Researcher, 22(5), 4-14.

Bennett, W. (1984). To reclaim a legacy. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bork, R. (1996). Slouching towards Gomorrah: Modern liberalism and the American decline. Reganbooks.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Conrad, C. F. (1985). Access to quality undergraduate education. Southern Regional Education Board, Commission for Educational Quality. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 662)

Craige, B. J. The University of Georgia. As cited in Simpson, R.D. & Frost, S.H. (1993). Inside college: Undergraduate education for the future. New York: Plenum Press.

Easton, J., and Guskey, T. (1983). Estimating the effects of college, department, course, and teacher on course completion rates. Research in Higher Education, 19, 153-158.

Finkelstein, M. (1984). The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Fordham, S. (1991). "Racelessness in private schools: Should we deconstruct the racial and cultural identity of African-American adolescents?" Teachers College Record, 92, 470-484.

Gumport, P. (1991). E Pluribus Unum? Academic structure, culture and the case of feminist scholarship. Higher Education, 15(1), 9-29.

Gumport, P. (1990). Feminist scholarship as a vocation. Higher Education, 20(3), 231-43.

Gumport, P. (1988). Curricula as signposts of cultural change. Review of Higher Education, 12(1), 49-61.

James, J. (1993). Vocational and general education: New relationships or shotgun marriage? League for Innovation in the Community College, Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 432)

Kozma, R., Belle, L., & Williams, G. (1978). Instructional techniques in higher education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Mauksch, H. (1981). What are the obstacles to improving quality teaching. Current Issues in Higher Education, 2(1), 49-56.

McCarthy C. (1993). "After the canon: Knowledge and ideological representation in the multicultural discourse on curriculum reform," from McCarthy, C., & Crichlow, W., (eds.), Race, identity and representation in education. New York: Routledge.

Milem, J. F., & Astin, H. S. (April,1992). Science faculty: Culture, roles and pedagogy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Milem, J. F., & Wakai, S. T. (1996). Understanding how faculty teach: Facilitators and inhibitators of student-centered pedagogy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Memphis, TN.

Mortimer, K. P. (1984). Involvement in learning. Washington, D. C.: National Insitute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 833)

Mulkay, M. (1972). The social process of motivation: A study in the sociology of science. London: Macmillan Press.

Obiakor, F. W. (1994, November). Multiculturalism in the university curriculum: Infusion for what? Paper presented at the Regents Conference on Diversity and Multiculturalism in the University Curriculum, Manhattan, KS.

Perry, J. R. (1987, November). The revival of general education programs in American colleges and universities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 439)

Pinar, W. (1993). "Notes on understanding curriculum as a racial text." In McCarthy & Crichlow (eds.). Race and identity. Routledge University Press.

Princes, C. D. W. and Igbineweka, A. O. (1995, February). The social and political dimensions of achieving a multicultural college curriculum. Paper presented at the Pennsylvania Black Conference on Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384 567)

Rodriguez, R. (1982). Hunger of memory: the education of Richard Rodriguez: an autobiography. Boston, Mass: D.R. Godine.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Arredondo, M., & Korn, W. S. (1996). The American college teacher: National Norms for the 1995-96 HERI faculty survey. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Schubert, W. (1986). Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm and possibility. New York: Macmillan.

Sculley, J. (1988). "A perspective on the future," Change. As cited in Simpson, R.D. & Frost, S.H. (1993). Inside college: Undergraduate education for the future. New York: Plenum Press.

Simpson, R.D. & Frost, S.H. (1993). Inside college: Undergraduate education for the future. New York: Plenum Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender and social class locations. Educational Foundations, 6(2), 7-32.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., Bentley, R. J., and Martens, G. G. (1990). Disciplinary differences in course planning. The Review of Higher Education, 13, 141-165.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., Ryan, M.P., and Genthon, M. (1988). Faculty reflect on course planning. Research in Higher Education, 29, 219-240.

Statham A., Richardson, L., and Cook, J. (1991). Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Takaki, R. (1995). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Toombs, W. & Tierney, W.G. (1991). Meeting the mandate: Renewing the college and department curriculum. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.6). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Wakai, S. T. (1994). Barriers to and facilitators of feminist pedagogy in college and university teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.